

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 26, 2006.

Currently, claims 18-20, 37, 39 and 41 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all pending claims.

Applicant first notes the discrepancy regarding the telephonic interview. Applicant honestly believes that during the telephonic interview, Applicant proposed the amendment stated in the Response B dated October 26, 2006. Applicant, however, does not wish to insult or otherwise disrespect the Examiner. Thus, Applicant will defer to the Examiner.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that “The applicant proposed to the Examiner an amendment to claims 37-39 and 41-43 in which a combination of image pattern recognition and sensors that do not use pattern recognition are used. The Examiner informed the applicant that amending the claims in such a way appear to overcome the current grounds of rejection, since DiCicco et al teaches using image pattern recognition or X-Y gyroscope sensors and does not teach the use of both in a single system.”

In light of the above quote from the Examiner, Applicant has amended claim 37 to recite “adding a line to said video using image pattern recognition and said one or more field of view sensors that do not use image pattern recognition.” Applicant believes that this amendment is what the Examiner is referring to in the above quote. Thus, Applicants assert that claim 37 is allowable over the cited prior art. Claim 39 is similarly amended and, therefore, is also allowable over the cited prior art.

Claim 41 has been amended to recite “determining said location’s position in said video using a first step process that makes use of said field of view data; performing a second step process to refine said position’s location in said video, said second step process uses image pattern recognition .” For similar reasons as discussed with respect to claim 37, Applicant asserts that the recited combination of field of view data and image pattern recognition renders claim 41 allowable over the prior art.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of all pending claims is

respectfully requested. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including July 26, 2006. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 26, 2006

By: /Burt Magen/
Burt Magen
Reg. No. 37,175

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105-2871
Telephone: (415) 369-9660